

## Message

**From:** Kay, Robert [rtkay@usgs.gov]  
**Sent:** 3/11/2014 10:17:45 PM  
**To:** Nordine, John [nordine.john@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Techalloy Feb. 2014 Progress Report

John--here is my review of the February 2014 Progress Report for the Central Wire/Techalloy site in Union, IL prepared by Autumwood Consultants and dated March 10, 2014.

**Summary of Validated Data and Results**--from the text in this section it appears that Autumwood has done all it intends to do presenting the results of the Dec. 2013 sampling to USEPA. However, the text in section 3, Upcoming Events/Activities Planned indicates Autumwood will respond to the review comments pertaining to the Dec. 2013 sampling made during the review of the Jan. 2014 Monthly Progress Report by April 1, 2014. If Autumwood intends to provide responses to the review of the January 2014 Progress Report in the pre-April 1 submittal, I'm fine with that approach.

If Autumwood does not plan on responding to our comments in a future submission, I will repeat an edited version of the review comments for the January 2014 Monthly Progress Report because they will not be addressed. Autumwood's "updated...graphs and plots...submitted...to USEPA by e-mail on Feb. 4 and 6, 2014" are not an adequate discussion of the Dec. 2013 sampling, nor is it an adequate presentation of the results of the sampling.

1. Some "Summary of Validated Data and Results" of the Dec. 2013 sampling should be provided in the appropriate monthly report. The information requested in the review of the January progress report still has not been provided.

a. As near as I can tell USEPA has not received the results of the Dec. 2013 sampling from the residential wells. Autumwood should provide a date for their delivery and mention the document they intend to provide the data in. If they intend to provide this information in the pre-April 2014 submittal, it could be mentioned in this section

b. USEPA should have been given the results of ALL of the Dec. 2013 sampling in the Jan. Progress Report or in this document in addition to some brief summary discussion of the Dec. 2013 data--were there any detections in the residential wells? which monitoring wells had MCL exceedences? for what compounds? If this information is not to be presented in the pre-April 1 submittal, Autumwood needs to note where and when they will provide this information.

c. this discussion should be supported by a figure showing the well locations, and a table or tables presenting a summary of all the sampling data from Dec. 2013, including the field notes and the readings of all the field parameters during well purging. Per previous discussions with CW, the Monthly Progress Reports are the appropriate documents for submission of all the field readings.

d. CW should submit the lab sheets providing the results of the Dec. well sampling in the appropriate Monthly Progress Report. Again, if they're not going to submit them in the Jan. or Feb. Monthly Progress Reports, they need to note the document they will submit this information in.

**Upcoming Events/Activities Planned**--I asked Autumwood to provide the date of sampling for the analysis described in the eDMR report, not confirmation that they will perform sampling in the future. The last sentence in this section can be deleted.

**eDMR Report**--the date this sample was collected should have been provided in the Progress Made This Reporting Period section.

Again, the lab reports for this sample should be provided in this document.